



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0386FL-1 for School Board of Orange County, Florida

### A. Vision (40 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant details and clearly articulates a comprehensive and coherent vision for reform which brings together students, educators, families and the community to focus on the type of learning environments and educational supports children will need to be college and career ready at the conclusion of their PreK – 12 education. The applicant delineates specific components to support the vision, as well as actions needed to bring goals embedded in the components of the vision to fruition. Many of the actions, listed as objectives, are bold steps (e.g., “restructuring and reculturing” for better personalization), and forward looking, and all clearly support the applicant’s vision for education reform. Components of the vision are explicitly linked to previous work in each of the four core assurance areas.</p> |           |       |
| (A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant outlines a detailed and doable approach to implement its reform proposal. Schools that will participate in the reform initiative (all schools in the district will be participant in the first component of the initiative while specific school will participate in other components of the initiative) are listed, as are the number of students in selection criteria categories.</p>   |           |       |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)  | 10        | 9     |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a high quality plan to effect meaningful reform in the district. Components which describe the applicant’s goals are accompanied by research-based rationales for their actions. Deliverables are clearly articulated, as are required activities and timelines for anticipated outcomes. Person’s responsible for efforts on the applicant’s part are not clearly discussed however. The applicant presents a detailed logic model for personalized learning (blended learning) and correspondingly, an access to effective educator logic model as the framework of how student learning will be improved.</p>   |           |       |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes that 80 per cent of students will achieve grade level proficiencies at the kindergarten-second grades, third-fifth grade, and 6-12 grade by 2017 in one section of the application. Although annual goals for student learning and performance are not presented in this section of the application, achievable goals are presented as part of a later section of the application (i.e., Section E(3)). Achievement gap data projections are embedded in annual performance goals. Goals for improved graduation rate and college enrollments are reasonable.</p>   |           |       |

### B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15        | 15    |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant documents at least two years in advancing learning among all participating schools in reading and math (four years of trend data are unavailable due to changes in state proficiency measures). The applicant also presents data showing a reduction in the achievement gap for a two year period however this positive trend did not continue for a third year. A positive trend in reducing the achievement gap continued following that year. Graduation rates in the district improved continuously over a four year period. The applicant documents performance successes at low achieving schools at the high school and middle school levels in the district as a result of district generated initiatives. The district has effectively improved its ability to make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents. They have adopted a data warehouse system; an instructional management system where instructional materials and information to monitor student progress can be accessed; and a web-based system of student information accessible to teachers, and selective information is accessible to parents.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a high level of transparency in the district's processes, practices, and investments. Financial and accountability reports are required to be published annually according to Florida statutes. The application documents total expenditures for personnel salaries, instructional staff only, teachers only, and or non-personnel expenditures.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes state statutes that both permit and encourage the development of learning environments to support accelerated student learning. Districts have the autonomy to develop a variety of learning environments, including the personalized learning environments proposed by the applicant.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents insufficient evidence that students and families were involved in the development of the RTT-D proposal. While there is evidence of union representation and teacher involvement in planning aspects of the proposal, there is limited evidence of participation from teachers and principals in participating schools in the development of the applicant's proposal. Further, while there are strong letters of support from city officials and community agencies, letters of support from important partnerships mentioned in the applicant's narrative (e.g., UCF Center for Modeling, Lockheed Martin, and Northrop Grumman) are not included.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes statements that are potentially goals for a high quality plan for analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments however they do not ensure that key elements of a high quality plan were or will be part of the process of determining needs and gaps related to implementation of a plan. The applicant mentions that they received a grant to support a diagnostic site visit. It is not clear how the visit or information from the diagnosis of the district as a result of the visit will relate to the district's needs and gaps in implementing personalized learning environments.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

|                             | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20        | 6     |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents insufficient information on how they will address the learning expectations included in the selection criteria. For example, there is no discussion of how they will empower students to understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant lacks information as to how they will ensure that students will

be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest to the student, or how students will develop critical skills such as goal setting, teamwork or problem solving. There is no discussion of how the applicant will ensure that students are exposed to high quality instructional approaches, or high quality content including digital learning content. The applicant does not provide information as to how they will ensure that students understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant includes a number of strategies to monitor students' progress and address behaviors that might interfere with students' success, as well as strategies to ensure that students have support (e.g., coaches, tutors, and mentors) for progress toward completing their education.

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 6 |
|---|----|---|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. While the applicant includes discussions of a number of activities, clear and consistent explication of goals, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible, specific to the selection criteria for this section of the application are not included. A discussion of teacher, principal, and administration evaluation is presented along with a discussion of a professional development model. Neither discussion however makes a strong case for the relationship between evaluation practices or the professional development model and the explicit selection criteria for the Teaching and Leading section of the grant proposal.

The applicant will be guided by Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation model however there is no clearly articulated crosswalk between expected teacher actions in the model and the expected teacher actions in the selection criteria for teaching that leads to a personalized learning environment. For example, there is no explicit discussion of how teachers will adapt content and instruction that will provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. It is not clear how the applicant perceives that learning resources developed for the reform proposals will actually work toward closing achievement gaps. The applicant does not effectively address how they will ensure that effective teachers will be available for hard-to-staff schools, subjects, or specialty areas. The applicant plans for or has developed a detailed personalized learning platform meant to ensure personalized learning and improved teachers and administrator performance to support student learning. Additional articulation is needed to show how these efforts are connected to the vision of how learning is accelerated and supported based on the applicant's vision of students proposed in C1.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15        | 8     |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructures. Their narrative suggests flexibility already exists at the district level over such factors as school schedules and personnel decisions. There is no discussion however of a plan for organizing school leadership teams or ensuring that flexibility and autonomy exist at the school level. While there is a discussion to suggest movement toward mastery learning, there is no plan as to how this might be completely accomplished. A clear discussion of how students will be given opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways is not included. Similarly, while there is a discussion of educational experiences of English language learners and student with disabilities, there is no plan to ensure access to learning resources for these students.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|----|---|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant currently has supportive infrastructures to support personalized learning, with plans to make improvements in some tools so that they are better able to provide information to students, educators, and parents. There is no discussion of technical supports to ensure that all groups are able to access and use available resources.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
|--|-----------|-------|

|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)  | 15 | 14 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a comprehensive continuous improvement process that includes strategies for collecting information on progress toward goals and a follow-up processes to ensure that any problematic areas are addressed. The applicant has experienced success with existing tracking, reviewing, and regulating processes set up by the Race to the Top Program Management Office. A sound plan for both internal and external evaluation of the applicant's implementation of the reform proposal is included, along with a discussion of acceptable statistical procedures to analyze data collected as the applicant initiates its proposal, during implementation of the proposal and beyond the point the applicant receives grant funds. Explicit plans for publicly sharing information on the quality of its investments are lacking.</p> |    |    |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)   | 5  | 5  |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a sound process for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders, one that is based on current strategies and protocols used by the applicant. Both internal and external stakeholders are included in the communication and engagement plans. In the case of the former, meetings, communication through email and telephone communications will be used. Community conveners will serve as a conduit for external stakeholders (e.g. businesses and non-profit organizations) to receive information from and provide input into reform efforts. The applicant proposes strategies that are effective for the constituents with whom they wish to communicate.</p>   |    |    |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)   | 5  | 5  |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents the appropriate number of performance measures required for each grade band, along with thorough explanations of rationales for their selection. A reasonable plan for quality audits is included as means for reviewing and improving measures over time.</p>  |    |    |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)  | 5  | 5  |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a detailed process for evaluating the effectiveness and quality of investments. A plan for using individual business cases is proposed for each project that is a component of the applicant's reform proposal. Based on a list of questions posed for each project, the applicant will be able to sufficiently determine the cost and benefits of the use of time, funds, staff, and other resources used for the project.</p>  |    |    |

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a budget that will sufficiently support development and implementation of the reform proposal. In a few instances, a more detailed rationale for fund expenditures could have been presented. For example, it is unclear why funds are allocated for consulting teaches and additional funds are allocated for consulting teacher mentoring bonuses. Even so the applicant generally provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and expenditures. Both one-time and ongoing expenditures are included and are reasonable given the applicant's project plans. Funds from other sources (e.g. State RRT Grant, Orange County Government, Teacher Incentive Fund grant) are accounted for in the applicant's budget.</p> |           |       |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)   | 10        | 8     |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a plan based on the district's intention to continue elements of the proposed reform at the conclusion of the grant, and discusses how state government funds will be available as well. The applicant is in partnership with other entities to form a philanthropic strategic plan committee to generate support which will contribute to the sustainability of the applicant's reform proposal. The applicant's sustainability plans as presented does not include key elements of a high quality</p>   |           |       |

plan (e.g., timelines and responsible parties, etc.).

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10        | 9     |

### Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a needed program for increasing the number of early learners arriving at kindergartner with improved readiness skills and capabilities. The district would partner with private preschool day care centers and the Early Learning Coalition of Orange County to ensure that increased numbers of young children have access to the assessments, curricula, and certified teachers believed to have a positive impact on school readiness. The program has a creative strategy for building the capacity of private childcare center staff so that they can contribute to the readiness levels of children most in need of improved social/emotional and literacy readiness skills. The program has a parent education component. Selected indicators would be tracked in order to determine the effectiveness of the initiative. The proposed program is based on an existing model in the district, and performance measures for intended results of the program are based on the success of the existing model. The expansion of this model is ambitious, yet based on previous success, and the deliverables appears to be achievable. It is not clear how the program will be sustained beyond the RTT-D grant period, nor is it clear how the model would be scaled beyond participating groups of students and teachers.

## Absolute Priority 1

|                     | Available   | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met   |

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant minimally meets Absolute Priority 1. They present a strong vision for reform, along with component parts that describe ways in which personalized learning environments meant to significantly improve learning and teaching could be accomplished. All four core educational assurances are addressed in the reform proposal. The applicant does not make a strong case for a connection between their proposed approach to student learning and correspondingly, their approach to teaching and leading, and the primary goal of creating environments designed to significantly improve teaching and learning through the personalization of strategies and tools to support student learning. It is not clear how the applicant empowers learners or deepens their learning. Shortcomings in these two pivotal areas compromise the efficacy of other areas of the proposal.

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 159 |
|-------|-----|-----|



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0386FL-2 for School Board of Orange County, Florida

## A. Vision (40 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
|  |           |       |

|   |    |    |
|---|----|----|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)  | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant offered a comprehensive and coherent reform vision made possible by a RTTT state grant that will serve 180,000 students, of which 64% qualify for free or reduced lunch, in the fourth largest district in the country.</p> <p>The applicant stated that the district is in its second year of implementing Common Core Standards that were introduced to Kindergarten-to-2nd grade teachers during 2011-2012. To meet its goal of fully implementing the Standards, the district will complete providing teachers at all levels with introductory training by 2014-2015.</p> <p>The applicant proposed using a new instructional management system to provide individual student performance data, curriculums in ELA and math aligned to the Standards, and teacher and principal performance data, which includes a value-added model leading to summative performance ratings for teachers and administrators.</p> <p>The applicant plans to continue the district's work on enhancing teacher induction programs to support the recruitment and retention of the best teacher candidates. Additional efforts include expanding professional development of teachers and administrators, providing for two types of incentive pay based on improved student achievement and teacher professional practice, and creating an Assistance Peer Review Model for first year teachers.</p> <p>The applicant proposed strengthening current reform efforts in order to improve student achievement in three of the district's lowest performing schools. These efforts center on restructuring and re-culturing the targeted schools to recreate smaller learning communities so that students can experience great personalization of learning and can develop supportive relationships with caring adults. Additional information provided includes tutoring and mentoring students who need extra support and providing for family focused and neighborhood based support services.</p> <p>Although not required, the applicant's proposal would have been strengthened by a more complete description of students to be served in the targeted schools, their parents, and their communities especially when discussing the district's vision for developing a personalized learning environment in these schools.</p> |    |    |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)   | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant explained that the district plan was to create and implement a personalized learning platform that would be district wide.</p> <p>The proposed plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of Wi-Fi coverage;</li> <li>• Standards-based instruction,</li> <li>• Strong instructional leadership by the principal; and</li> <li>• Implementation of a teacher evaluation system.</li> </ul> <p>The district plan includes implementation of a school transformation model at two high schools and their feeder middle schools. Selection of these schools was based on student achievement data in reading and math, percent of students eligible for free or reduced meals, and graduation and drop-out rates at the high schools. Additional components included expanding Pre-K programs within the feeder pattern within one of the high schools, implementing a value added model, creating and implementing an Observer Quality Assurance Program, implementing a Common Core Instructional Model, and creating and implementing a Peer Assistance and Peer Review Program for new teachers.</p> <p>A list of all participating schools was included. The number of participating educators is anticipated at 13,891, and the number of students to be served was listed as 183,376. Of these, 97,691 students are low income, 28,338 are English learners, and 21,443 are students with disabilities.</p>   |    |    |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)   | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes how the proposed reform will achieve project goals that include the following components: a personalized learning platform, implementation of a school transformational model at two high schools and their feeder middle</p>   |    |    |

schools, implementation of a Common Core Instructional Model, and enhancement of the state's Value Added Model.

Next, the applicant described the order in which its plan would be implemented:

- Reformulation of the State Common Core Standards as measurable topics
- Tracking student progress on measurement topics
- Providing support for individual students

Finally, applicant discussed the creation and implementation of a peer assistance and peer review program for new teachers and veteran teachers for the purposes of increasing the number of effective teachers and increasing the retention of effective teacher. Applicant stated that by 2017, the district would like 80% of parents to report that they are satisfied with the quality of education being provided by teachers.

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan as discussed is likely to result in improved student learning, performance, and equity based on ambitious yet achievable goals overall and by student subgroup.

Adoption of more rigorous state standards in reading, math, and science across all grade levels negatively impacted achievement scores initially; however, student performance has shown impressive gains over the last two academic years, in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Results for this period were:

- Overall learning gains for students in all eligible grades in reading increased from 50.6 to 64.7, and in math from 50.3 to 65.5;
- Learning gains for the lowest 25% of students increased from 31.9 to 64.7 in reading, and 29.2 to 60.8 in math;
- Students' math proficiency increased from 55.8 to 59.4 in fourth grade for all eligible students, and from 56.3 to 56.6 in fifth grade for all eligible students; and,
- The school district grade for 2011-2012 was a B.

These results indicated increased student achievement when comparing the district's results to those in larger school districts.

The applicant stated that subgroup data for 2011-2012 had not yet been released prior to submission of this application. Progress in closing the gap was noted for 2008-2009, but not for 2010-2011, although applicant reports a 2-point reduction in the gap in math for Black and Hispanic students.

Applicant reported that the district's graduation rate has increased each year since 2006-2007. Data on the district's graduation rate was not fully discussed and was not desegregated by subgroup.

The applicant discussed the district's efforts in preparing students for college. The percent of students enrolled in Level 3 math courses beyond Algebra II Honors and Level 3 science courses beyond Chemistry Honors increased from 13.0% in 2009-2010 to 15.0% in 2012-2013, and in science from 18.1% to 23.7%. Moreover, there was a significant increase in students earning grades of A, B, or C in these courses in 2011-2012.

Evidence was provided of successful preparation for college readiness of students in under-represented groups with high performance on AP exams. Students from every subgroup, which includes Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, and Other, increased in performance. The number of Hispanic students enrolled in AP courses increased from 22.35% in 2009-2010, to 27.39% in 2012-2013. No data was provided on actual college enrollment rates for students from any group. No discussion or data was provided on college attainment rates.

Goals related to graduation and college enrollment rates as presented are ambitious but achievable. A fuller discussion on the district's plan to reduce the achievement gap would have strengthened the application.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15        | 15    |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant began with discussion of the district's success in three targeted schools identified as low performing from 2008-2009 through 2011-2012. All three schools have a state school grade of C, with two schools moving from a grade of D to a

grade of C.

Not all data demonstrated gains; for example, in one high school, 51.4% of students made gains in reading although the percent in the proficient ranking declined 5.6 points. It was difficult to determine whether gains reported were for all students or for the lowest performing 25% of students. However, there were significant gains in reading, math, writing, and science reported for all students in the low performing schools. Gains for the lowest 25% of students included:

- In one high school: 62.8% showed gains reading;
- In one middle school: 65.1% made gains in reading, and 64.8% made gains in math;
- In a second high school: 61.3% made gains in reading.

Applicant stated that these data would drive planning, training, instruction, and intervention in these schools.

The applicant described a district plan for reform in its persistently low performing schools in order to increase district oversight, accountability and support. Various goals were outlined that included:

- Cultivating instructional school leadership teams
- Developing school-wide approaches from implementing instructional strategies
- Identifying monitoring systems involving staff development, teacher capacity, and student progress
- Developing the culture of honest conversations with school staff
- Ensuring sustainability of best practices be becoming culturally embedded in school operations.

In order to implement the reform plan, a six-step process plan of involvement was developed that included data gathering, debriefing by the district resource team, sharing the results with the principal and area superintendent, follow-up by the district resource staff and school leadership staff to develop an action plan, engaging a monthly progress monitoring schedule, and developing a data-driven sustainability plan. This plan of involvement has been maintained for each school with additional support from a school improvement grant to increase teacher capacity and student engagement. These efforts led to four interventions: building school leadership, developing teacher capacity, implementing operational changes, and providing performance and differentiated pay.

Although not required, the applicant's proposal would have been strengthened by a more complete description of students to be served in the targeted schools, their parents, and their communities especially when discussing the district's vision for developing a personalized learning environment in these schools.

The applicant described three advancements made regarding the availability of student performance data: establishing the Enterprise Data Warehouse, development of the Instructional Management System, and the use of ProgressBook. Each offers information on key performance indicators, such as attendance, discipline, performance data, course work, college readiness, and learning gains. Applicant stated that the Instructional Management System and the ProgressBook were accessible to students and parents, and that the ProgressBook provided a user-friendly format that displays individual student grade average, progress details, report cards, homework, and other school information. In addition to these district resources, educators, students, and parents have access to student performance data on the state website.

The applicant provided evidence of the district's record over the past four years in improving learning outcomes, closing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant reports that by state statutes, districts are required to publish an annual school accountability report that includes a school financial report. The report, available in an accessible format easy to understand, is intended to inform parents and the public of the use of public funds for operating schools.

Expenditures at the school level for personnel salaries (average expenditures) of teachers, substitute teachers, and paraprofessionals who provide direct instruction to students in basic programs, at-risk programs, special programs, career education programs, and adults programs is reported. District level expenditures are reported as total expenditures per full



time equivalent student.

In addition, the district provides a list containing the name, address, job title, and salary of every employee to the public media. These data include actual salaries at the school level for instructional staff only and for teachers only, and actual expenditures for non-personnel expenditures at the school level. The applicant provided supporting evidence of this information in several appendices.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reported that the state passed legislation in 2012, House Bill 7059, for the purpose of establishing an academically challenging curriculum or accelerated instruction to enhance learning to eligible students K-12. According to the applicant, this legislation will assist in the district's efforts to develop personalized learning opportunities that are focused on mastery rather than seat time.

The applicant proceeded to describe a variety of creative options available to students, such as International Baccalaureate magnet programs, dual enrollment programs, magnet programs (theater and performing arts, foreign language, criminal justice, medical technology, veterinary science), Advanced Placement and Honors Programs, and career and technical programs. In addition, the district created a virtual school for grades 6-12 and grades K-5, and two academies that offer a rigorous course of study in a variety of learning formats (block scheduling, school-work programs, mentoring programs).

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant discussed stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and support for the proposal. Letters of support for the proposal were submitted from key stakeholders although evidence of wide support from teachers in participating schools and from significant stakeholders was not provided.

Applicant stated that the proposal was the result of collaborative teams of individuals from schools and the district created as part of the RTTT initiative. The district adopted a school transformation model that led to the creation of Evans Community School for the purpose of creating a comprehensive support system focused on student achievement and well-being.

The Community School is housed at Evans High School, one of the targeted schools, and brings together several organizations including social services, higher education, and local community groups. The effort appears to have strengthened the community's relationship with schools, families, and local businesses for the purpose of supporting the health and safety of children and youth to improve learning and of building stronger families and neighborhoods. The applicant suggests that the success of the Community School has led to interest by parents to replicate the model in other schools.

Based on this interest, district and area administrators explored implementation the Smaller Learning Community Secondary Model, known as Talent Development, in the lowest performing secondary schools in the district. District personnel and administrators shared information about and gained support for the model in a series of meetings with the faculties, administrators, and parents of three targeted secondary schools. All showed interest and support for using this model to develop a program similar to the Community School.

Through the district's reform efforts, the applicant states that collaborative teams of teachers and school administrators participated in the redesign and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation system and in discussions and implementation of Common Core Instructional Improvement projects. The applicant did not discuss whether the district had collective bargaining representation. No evidence was provided that 70% of teachers from participating schools supported the proposal.

Letters of support for the proposal included letters from the district superintendent, the Orange County Mayor, the Orlando Mayor, Orange County Family Support Department, the Foundation for Orange County Schools, and the Heart of Florida United Way. Letter of support from parent and student organizations, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, or institutions of higher education were not submitted.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence of a quality plan for analyzing the district's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and explained the logic behind the reform proposal. Discussion of the district's identified needs and gaps to be addressed was incomplete although a plan to identify these was provided.

Applicant began by stating that the district had all the components in place to implement a personalized learning environment in district schools. This was followed by an explanation of a grant that would provide support for a diagnostic visit that would include use of a research based rubric, the collection and analysis of interviews, review of district documents, and observations. The framework to be used for this analysis will be organized around three categories: Teaching and Learning, District Leadership, and Organizational Structure and Climate. Although not directly stated, the applicant suggested through inclusion of this information that the completed diagnosis would inform the district's implementation of personalized learning environments.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points)   | 20        | 15    |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant explained the district's plan to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to provide all students with support to graduate college-and career-ready.</p> <p>The district's approach is based on a school transformation model that includes four elements: effective whole school reform, a teacher friendly early warning data system, an intervention team of adults who work closely with teachers and administrators, and a team based organizational structure and collaborative work environment. Three major initiatives were provided: Talent Development (Smaller Learning Communities), City Year (Tutoring and Mentoring), and Communities in Schools (Neighborhood Centers for Families).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Components of Talent Development initiative calls for the integration of a set of instructional, teacher and administrative support, professional development, and organizational strategies to raise achievement, promotion, and graduation rates by creating a personalized learning environment for students and teachers.</li> <li>Components in the City Year initiative includes placing a team of trained corps members (young adults) in each school four days a week to work with an assigned group of students (exhibiting early warning indicators) inside and outside of school hours throughout the entire year. Members of the City Year teams work on literacy, math, attendance, and behavior interventions.</li> <li>Components of the Communities in Schools initiative requires placing a site coordinator in each targeted school to assess the specialized intensive support needed by students exhibiting the highest degree of off-track indicator and will working with Neighborhood Centers for Families to identify and provided needed support.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant described additional support based on individual school needs. Examples of these included: full-time, school based ELA and math coaches; accelerated learning, extra help classes in math and English, extended day programs, monthly implementation review meetings with district leadership, and small learning communities that include a 9th grade academy and two or more thematic academies for grades 10-12.</p> <p>Not every criterion was fully addressed. Critical information was provided in the appendix that was not discussed in the narrative. It was unclear what role parents would assume in the efforts described. Reference to families was included in one appendix outlining the district's Diplomas Now Implementation Plan, which listed awareness events by Diplomas Now teams for family and community members. There was little direct discussion in the proposal on promoting students' self-efficacy. These were the most serious weaknesses. Among the questions that were not fully answered were how the district would provide access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives; how the district would support students in mastering skills and traits like perseverance, critical thinking, creativity, or problem-solving; and how the district would ensure that students would identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college.</p> |           |       |
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)   | 20        | 18    |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant discussed the district's approach to teaching and leading that assists district educators in improving instruction and increasing their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college-and career-ready standards or college-and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling implementation of personalized learning and teaching. The applicant's responses centered on educator evaluation, professional development, and implementation of a Personalized Learning Platform Design.</p> <p>Beginning in 2010, participating educators engaged in training to support their individual and collective capacity as members of a core group of stakeholders, consisting of teachers, principals, Classroom Teachers Association representatives, and district</p>   |           |       |

personnel, to re-develop teacher evaluation tools and processes. This was followed by a similar effort in 2012, where a group of district educators, consisting of principals, assistant principals, district administrators, charter school administrators, the senior executive of Human Resources, associate superintendents, and area superintendents, worked to redesign a school administrator evaluation model following adoption of the Marzano School Leadership Evaluation Model. The applicant also discussed the process used to evaluate the superintendent, a responsibility of the School Board who selects, appoints, supervises, and evaluates the superintendent's performance.

Under the state's RTTT initiative, the district is required to use student performance data on statewide assessments as a significant factor in evaluation of all district level staff including the superintendent by 2014. For this reason, the district is working to examine evaluation instruments for all educators to be consistent with the protocols and language of the Marzano Model. Through this process, district educators identified the need for continuous professional development that was job-embedded in the context of the classroom. The district evaluation committee also identified the value of the Peer Assistance and Peer Review programs designed to assist new and veteran teachers to improve their knowledge and skills.

The applicant provided the district's plan to pilot the Personalized Learning Platform at an elementary school to test and to refine the platform before scaling it to elementary schools that serve the feeder pattern to the targeted schools and then to all schools district wide. A description was provided on the Platform, which was designed to bring together groups of users: content users, learners, and performance trackers. Implementation information was provided on the initial targeted groups, software development, and key system components.

The applicant discussed the district's plan for all participating school leaders and school leadership teams with training, policies, tools, data, and resources that will enable them to structure an effective learning environment through a formative improvement system centered on implementing Common Core Instructional Improvement. In this section of the proposal, the applicant addressed the importance of specific teaching strategies to enhance students' independent thinking skills as well as other strategies in a model called the Five Pillars of Common Core Excellence. This model includes Learning Goals, New Knowledge, Deepening Knowledge, and Independent Thinking. Applicant included an example of professional development based on this model.

Showing a sophisticated understanding of the weaknesses of current reform efforts, the applicant explained the district's philosophy of needing to go beyond the standards and discussed the dangers in measurement-based models of instruction when so many teachers fail to engage students in inquiry-based lessons. The applicant stated that comprehensive, independent, macro-level understanding of all aspects of the new standards will lead to learning gains.

The applicant discussed implementation of the district's Formative Value Added Model, including scoring, validity issues, the criteria in the various levels in the models, and the training schedule to ensure accuracy and observer quality.

Not every criterion was fully addressed. Some information was incomplete, was not fully addressed, or was not addressed directly, such as information on measuring student progress and using data to inform acceleration of student progress; on closing achievement gaps; and, on increasing the number of students receiving instruction from effective or highly effective teachers and principals including hard-to-staff schools and specialty areas. However, some of this information was provided in other sections of the proposal.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)   | 15        | 12    |
| (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:   |           |       |
| <p>The applicant discussed the district's practices, policies, and rules that would facilitate implementation of the proposed plan.</p> <p>To provide support and services to schools, including all participating schools, the district is organized into ten divisions, five are Learning Communities, and five are within the central office structure. Each learning community has an area superintendent and staff; the five divisions in the central office include Division of Teaching and Learning, Facilities Services, Fiscal Services, Human Resources and Executives Office, and Operations.</p> |           |       |

Each area superintendent has the autonomy to operate schools within the area according to the needs of the students within state and district limitations. Area superintendents and principals have control over hiring and assignment of personnel, and area principals have wide discretion in determining instructional calendars and schedules except for the district-wide calendar, which is formulated at the district level and requires board approval.

District-wide implementation of mastery learning rather than seat time has been problematic although the district plans to develop and align resources, structures and support to implement mastery learning in schools across the district. The applicant stated that mastery learning would require changes in expectations of parents on grading and student progress, and there had not been enough time to discuss, plan, and implement mastery learning with input of families and other stakeholders. No specific plan or anticipated challenges on gaining support from students, families, and other stakeholders for mastery learning were discussed.

The applicant included discussion of the district's support for English learners although no information was offered on the size of this subgroup in the targeted schools. Teachers in the primary grades who work with English learners are required to obtain ESOL endorsement. It was unclear whether students in this subgroup were given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways.

This discussion was followed by a description of the district's Exceptional Student Education Program, which includes 14 programs and related services to eligible students from PreK-12. No information was offered on the number of students served by this program. It was unclear whether students in this subgroup were given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways.

The applicant did not include information on whether students outside of these groups were given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways although this may be addressed in other sections of the proposal.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|--|----|---|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlined four ways that the district provides for students, educators, and other stakeholders to access performance data and curriculum support. This includes the Enterprise Data Warehouse, the Instructional Management System, the ProgressBook, and the district website.

Although the data available on these resources is available to educators, it was unclear whether all students and parents would have access given the English learner student population. Information on the size of this population was not provided but was minimally referenced. It is unclear whether technical support is provided to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders.

The district plans to expand the Instructional Management System by adding a Personalized Learning Platform to be used by students for the purposes of remediation and accelerating learning based on individual needs and interests. The applicant stated that the district and schools have access to four types of data systems, which were described. Information on the availability to major stakeholders of budget information was incomplete or missing.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15        | 14    |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explained that management and implementation of the proposed project would be organized through the district's standard project management standards and procedures. Proven successful strategies as explained provides an established management process for tracking, reviewing, and regulating progress to meet all identified goals through the life of the grant. The plan calls for continuous monitoring and identification of possible areas needing attention by the project team.

Key components of the Project Management Continuous Improvement process include:

- Meetings of the project manager with key stakeholders through a collaborative website (key stakeholders were not identified)
- Mapping by the project manager of an overall management system to plan, identify, and cost out resources, purchases,

and contracts

- Additional responsibilities by the project manager, such as planning inputs and outputs and desired outcomes to be assessed and monitored; defining and establishing quality requirements including plans for quality audits; assessing risks and developing risk responses
- Regular meetings with business process owners to identify potential issues and resolutions
- A change management process to ensure compliance
- A documentation process to control, monitor, and maintain information
- Project accounting and a management process to monitor sub-recipients as needed

The applicant discussed Post-Implementation reporting to the Department, included discussion on project evaluation, and provided a list of key personnel.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlined key processes of the district's Project Management Communication process to be led by the project manager as part of the overall management plan.

The process includes defining an appropriate communication strategy for each stakeholder to be provided in the desired format. The manager will communicate with internal stakeholders through email, telephone, and regular meetings. With external stakeholders, the manager will provide regular updates and will provide opportunities for input by community conveners, such as the Foundations for Orange Public Schools, which has access to both business and non-profit organizations.

The district's plan to include other stakeholders' input outside of these groups would be part of the responsibility of the internal and external evaluator who be jointly required to identify and engage stakeholders following specific guidelines. These guidelines include soliciting recommendations, prioritizing data collection and reports based on stakeholder input, involving stakeholders in designing and conducting evaluation, and being inclusive by ensuring gender, race or ethnicity, or language would not be barriers to participation.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant included over 20 performance measures (called Key Performance Indicators) that would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed project. Measures, overall and by subgroup, appear thoughtful, ambitious, and achievable.

Each measure was selected and aligned to one of 11 Essential Outcomes that define and assess progress on meeting the district's goals of "intense focus on student achievement" and "closing the achievement gap." The first goal "Intense Focus on Student Achievement" is aligned with state, district, and school efforts with the targeted end result of increasing high school graduation rates. A list of the 11 Essential Outcomes was included.

Examples of performance measures include: College Enrollment Rate, Percentage of Effective Teachers; Decrease in the Middle School Achievement Gap for subgroups in Reading, and Decrease in the High School Achievement Gap for subgroup in reading. A rationale was provided for each measure as was how the measure would provide rigorous, timely, and formative information.

The district plans includes continuously collecting and analyzing data to measure progress towards achieving strategic goals. The applicant stated that the project team would define and establish quality requirements regarding performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high quality plan on evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed project's funded activities and on more productively using time, staff, money, or other resources to improve results.

The district currently has in place Project Management Protocols for evaluating the effectiveness of the investments in the proposed project. Cost-benefit analysis will be used to evaluate the quality of the investments, and the internal and external evaluators will identify all known costs and benefits associated with the project.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)   | 10        | 8     |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget identified funds to support the project and provided narratives and tables.</p> <p>The district receives a significant amount of funding including from RTTT, a Teacher Incentive Grant, Title I, Title II, Title III, IDEA, Orange County Government funding, district funding, and state general funding. The total amount requested for this project is \$39,852.047, and the total for other funding support for the project, located in the Application for Federal Assistance form, was listed as \$1,899,825.76, over the grant period.</p> <p>The proposed project is built around strategies designed for the sustainability of personalized learning environments in targeted schools. Strategies include but are not limited to development of a Personalized Learning Platform, implementation of a student intervention model, integration of Formative Value Added Model, continuation of an early warning indicator team for students and families, and full day pre-kindergarten for four-year olds in 12 schools.</p> <p>The amount requested appears reasonable and sufficient to support the project.</p> <p>The overall budget narrative and tables were difficult to read as several project level budgets were submitted. Identification of all funds to support the project was not included in the tables submitted but was discussed in the proposal narrative. Identification of funds to be used for one-time investments was provided and included desktop/notebooks, printers, and iPads.</p> |           |       |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposed project is built around sustainability of personalized learning environments in targeted schools after the term of the grant.</p> <p>The district receives a significant amount of funding including from RTTT, a Teacher Incentive Grant, Title I, Title II, Title III, IDEA, Orange County Government funding, district funding, and state general funding. The applicant outlined a budget for the term of the grant that included budget assumptions, potential sources (discussed in the proposal narrative), and identification on the use of all requested funds.</p>   |           |       |

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)  | 10        | 9     |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes the district's goal of expanding a Full-Day Pre-Kindergarten Initiative and increasing the number of four-year olds to attend a full-day, full-year program with highly effective teachers supported by paraprofessionals with a focus of supporting the program in the highest-need elementary schools. A second goal is to increase the number of Pre-K classrooms that serve students with developmental delays and disabilities. The initiative will begin within the feeder-pattern areas of one of the targeted high schools. The applicant estimates that the initiative would serve 1861 students per year.</p> <p>Applicant listed significant challenges associated with implementation of this initiative, such as the high poverty rates (over 90%) of children attending Title I elementary schools, and the need to expand the number of full day Pre-K programs for children in these schools. The district's plan includes working with other agencies with the goal of replacing similar programs with Pre-K programs with higher standards and taught by effective, certified early childhood educators.</p> <p>The applicant described other components of the plan including:</p> |           |       |

- Adding a state assessment component that monitors measures aligned with Early Learning Standards;
- Adding a state readiness screener to screen each child's readiness for kindergarten;
- Partnering with schools in high need neighborhoods to share the cost of the program;
- Collaboration with the Early Learning Coalition of Central Florida to implement a Pre-K curriculum that supports early identification and treatment for children at risk for reading failure.

To implement this initiative, the applicant plans to build on the capacity of feeder early childhood providers to deliver higher quality instruction and to recruit among the targeted communities early childhood providers to participate in an enhanced Pre-K program. Supporting materials included a timeline, activities, and a list of responsible parties.

The applicant's plan would provide some services that address social-emotional, behavior needs, and acculturation of immigrants; however, this part of the proposal was inadequate. While children's developmental needs were discussed, there was little discussion on critical race, cultural, or language issues that might be a factor in adapting any instructional model, in communicating with children's parents, or in gaining their support. The applicant proposes creating a Resource Support Team, to include a behavioral specialist, speech pathologist, exceptional education teacher, and a social worker, to provide to students, teachers, and parents. Supporting evidence included a table outlining population group, type of result, and desired results.

The weakest part of the initiative is an inadequate response in gaining the substantive engagement of parents and families in the decision-making process and in developing a plan to identify and address student and family needs. The strongest part of the proposed initiative was the focus on Pre-K and the connections made about success at the Pre-K level to students' later academic performance.

## Absolute Priority 1

|                     | Available   | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met   |

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a largely coherent and comprehensive plan designed to create learning environments that will significantly improve learning for 180,000 students, of which 64% qualify for free or reduced lunch, in the fourth largest school district in the country.

The applicant proposed strengthening on-going reform efforts in order to improve student achievement in three of the district's lowest performing schools. These efforts center on restructuring and re-culturing the targeted schools to recreate smaller learning communities so that students can experience great personalization of learning designed to improve learning, accelerate student achievement that leads to college- and career ready graduation, and close the achievement gap.

While the plan submitted was strong and logical, certain important considerations were inadequate. A complete description of the students, families, and communities to be impacted and a detailed plan to include teachers, parents, and students throughout the implementation process were needed. Inclusion of a strong cultural component and support from civil rights and community organizations would have strengthened the proposal considerably. Lack of a strong family and parent component was most evident at the decision-making level.

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 183 |
|-------|-----|-----|



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0386FL-3 for School Board of Orange County, Florida

### A. Vision (40 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provides a clear and concise delivery of the reform vision called the OCPS Personalized Learning Environment. The narrative for this section consists of seven components. Each component is described in detail with references to the demographic composition of the LEA (serves over 180,000 students in 184 schools: 64% qualify for free or reduced priced meals at school. Under each component are a list of objectives that specify a timeline or projected time for implementing and completing specific activities. In addition, specific tools to measure performance measures and parties responsible for carrying out the objectives are included. The measures proposed are reasonable and are well grounded in empirical data from existing data bases in the LEA. The FVAM figures prominently in the objectives. Signed assurances are provided in appendix 1 that supports the claim that 100% of the LEA leadership is dedicated to the RTTD reform proposal.</p> <p>The four assurance areas of the RTTD are identified and acknowledged with attention to how the OCPS vision will meet them. In the narrative for each RTT assurance (1-4) are targeted dates for implementing the reform and explanation of how existing models like the Florida Value-Added Model and Formative Value-Added model will operate. In addition, data is provided in the appendix that supports the proposed avenues of reform. The appendices are well-organized and clearly identified. Clearly the writing team considered all of the dimensions required for the proposal. It has been demonstrated that this section deserves all ten points because it addressed the key areas of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity.</p> |           |       |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative provides an excellent rationale for its approach to implementing the model. The process for selecting schools is organized around seven components. Each component provides an explanation of specific actions taken to meet the proposed measure e.g. create and implement a personalized learning platform (PLP) has four criteria. Described as a "roll out" this measure will guide the sequencing of the initiative. Particularly impressive is the description of the protocol for selecting public school prekindergarten programs. A list of schools is provided that is organized by components. The total number of students participating in the proposed reform will be 183,376 of which 97,691 are low income, 28,338 are ELL, 21, 443 are students with disabilities, and there are 13,891 participating educators. It is clear that the reform proposal will provide key educational services for high need students. This is an ambitious, but achievable set of measures. Ten points is awarded for this section.</p>  |           |       |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The explanation of the theory of action in selecting the components of the proposed project is well-supported with current empirical quantitative research. This is a major strength of this section because it demonstrates a concerted effort to merge theory and practice. Model such as the Learning Platform for Blended Learning is particularly interesting. A detailed explanation of blended learning is provided in an appendix. This was not the only study or model explained in such detail. Diplomas Now and the research of Marzano is presented as empirical evidence to support the proposal. Professor Marzano is affiliated with the LEA which is a strength because it is always beneficial to have a strong research and accountability component to address district, school, student subgroup, and individual progress. All components of a high quality plan were addressed in this section.</p>  |           |       |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)   | 10        | 9     |



(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Based on the data presented in the appendices (14, 15, & 16) and in the tables depicting point achievement gaps, there is a strong record for improving student outcomes. Summative assessments are described in detail that explains how proficiency is currently positioned and its history of growth. A table presents five performance areas that have shown increase in two academic years. The graduation rates are measured by the NGA. According to an OCPS memo (appendix 16) there has been a substantial increase in rates. Advanced Placement programs and International Bac. Programs have been instrumental in increasing readiness for college. The data shows an increase of Hispanic enrollment in AP exams. There was no mention of performance by subgroups on the AP exams. The plan to address college enrollment was presented in a table. The targeted goals for five consecutive academic years is reasonable.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)  | 15        | 13    |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Three schools – Evans HS, Memorial MS, and Oak Ridge HS – identified as persistently low-performing were presented as case studies of a record of success. Student achievement scores from the past four academic years were presented in science and reading. Math was not addressed because of the change in testing with EOC exams. Reporting of any data from math achievement provides a clear picture of achievement. Graduation rates and college enrollment were not addressed in this section (B-1-a).</p> <p>Achieving ambitious and significant reforms in persistently low-achieving schools have been involved in a Plan of Involvement school process. Details about this program are provided in Appendix 22. The POI is well –organized (four interventions in place) and is a strong indicator of this LEA's demonstrated commitment to the students, their families, and teachers at these schools. The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is presented as a means of providing incentives for teacher performance. Like previous sections, this section is also well-documented with concise discussion.</p> <p>The LEA provides student performance data through three systems: Enterprise Data Warehouse, Instructional Management System, and ProgressBook. Each of the systems is described. The descriptions depict efficient and thorough systems for reporting data. There is no discussion of how effective the systems in terms of accessibility for parents and students. The OCPS website is also mentioned. Screenshots are made available in the appendices (19, 20, &amp; 21).</p> <p>While the narrative presents a concise description of existing programs and programs for the future, an absence of attention to graduation rates, college enrollment, and the effectiveness of the three systems mentioned in the paragraph above results in granting 13 points to this section.</p> |           |       |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)  | 5         | 5     |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Personnel salaries for all entities are posted at the website. The data for all four school-level expenditures are provided in appendices 23, 24, &amp; 25. This is required by a state statute. The minimum requirements of this section were met with the appropriate data.</p>   |           |       |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative presents a concise overview of the state's initiatives for education reform. State legislation (HB 7059) that created academically challenging curriculum or accelerated instruction to eligible public schools (K-12) students. This is presented as evidence of state support of personalized learning opportunities. In addition, five other learning options are</p>  |           |       |

presented on page 37. This illustrates a strong set of conditions of the state to implement the proposed reform. Autonomy as a concept is not fully developed in this section, but it can be inferred from the existence of the programs mentioned above and the creation of an online program (OCVS) and the opening of two new schools. These schools are exercising autonomy in the features of their unique programs of study. The minimum conditions have been met with this narrative and accompanying evidence.

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
|---|----|---|

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The approach taken in this section was case study. The case of Evans Community School was presented as evidence. The description is general and provides key goals of that specific program, and the point is made that it serves as model for other districts. Detailed information on *how* families, teachers, and students engaged in the development of the proposal is not available.

In terms of describing item "i" under subsection (a), the description is general. There is no mention of the quality of working relationship between the LEA and collective bargaining representation. There is no evidence of how teachers in participating schools were actively engaged in supporting the proposal.

Letters of support from such key stakeholders...: In appendix 26 letters were provided. There were a substantial number of letters of support from mayors. The other letters were from parent organizations, early learning programs, and the business community. There was a marked absence of letters of support from civil rights organizations and student organizations.

Due to absence of attention to how families, teachers, and student engagement and an absence of evidence on the relationship between the LEA and collective bargaining representation, full credit is not assigned to this section.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
|--|---|---|

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative and evidence provided for this section of the grant demonstrated an ambitious but achievable high quality plan that provides five statements regarding the capacity of the LEA to create and sustain a personalized learning environment. The statements are listed on page 41. The needs and gaps presented in this section are acknowledged as areas of immediate concern that require immediate action. Diagnostic visits are implemented through a grant The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation. Given this information in addition to the other areas -- key goals, rationale, activities, timeline, and responsible parties -- and the information in the narrative for this section, it appears that this LEA is making good progress. Five points are awarded to this section.

The activities or plan of action to address each of the goals are reasonable and are built the current infrastructure. The rationale is clearly presented in the discussion of the logic behind the reform proposal. The deliverables proposed in this section support the development of effective personalized learning strategies. Parties responsible for implementing the activities are not directly addressed in the narrative. Overall the credibility of this plan is very good, reasonable, and ambitious, but achievable.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

|                             | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20        | 18    |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section calls for a high-quality plan that calls for three-part approach to learning that engages and empowers are learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner. The plan proposed by the LEA focuses on component #2 which is school transformation model. The proposed model is called Diplomas Now. Based on what was presented in this section and sections previous to this, it appears that the proposed plan will emphasize the centrality of learning for individual success. The checks in place with Diploma Now as presented has potential to address the three-key indicators of being "off-track." The statistics provided in the narrative are drawn from empirical research appears to have been

conducted by researchers at John Hopkins University. The narrative does not offer any information about the generalizability of the findings from the study that informed the development of this program (Diploma Now). Thus it is not clear if this model will serve the particular needs of high-need students in the LEA. Following the discussion of Diploma Now is a description of three additional programs that are viewed as supportive in reaching this goal. The descriptions are important to building a case of support, however, there was an absence of how these programs including Diploma Now will address “deep learning experiences,” “access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives,” and mastering critical academic content.

The second section (subcategory b) calls for strategies to ensure that each student has access to five elements. A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development has the potential to be achieved with the four programs described. Digital learning content is also listed in the notice, but is not addressed directly in the narrative. Accommodations... for high need students will be addressed by the four programs like Diploma Now. Finally ongoing and frequent feedback is to be addressed in the School Transformation Model.

The third section (subcategory c) calls for an explanation of how mechanisms will operate. The School Transformation Model and the Diploma Now programs are presented as avenues to addressing this element. The tools and resources are provided by the LEA and it is up to the responsible parties to implement them. Overall, the plan is adequate. The absence of attention to “access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives” is significant.

|   |    |    |
|---|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 17 |
|---|----|----|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Teaching and leading is a key component for preparing students for college and careers. In addressing all parts of three subcategories (a, b, and c), the proposal was effective in providing specific examples of how educators will engage in training, and in gaining access via professional development to use tools, data, and resources. Subsection c focused on school leaders and leadership teams. Robert Marzano’s model figures prominently in the narrative and in reform up to this point. It was pointed out that during the development phase of an evaluation instrument, the state government introduced the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation model and it became the model. This is an important point in light of an earlier discussion of autonomy that LEAs and districts exercise. It appears from the documents presented that the president of Orange CTA (union) and a team were asked to review a 1998 version of the Peer Assistance and Peer Review document (Appendix 33). A version of this model will be implemented. It is unclear what modified version is and how it differs from the 1998 document. The evidence provided in the narrative and appendices provide adequate attention to meeting the key goals of C-2. The activities are clearly defined, the parties responsible for carrying out elements of the reform plan are clear, and the rationale is linked to existing research. Timelines are also incorporated in terms of school year targets. While the narrative provides solid description of most of the elements outlined in the notice, there was an absence of detailed discussion of how the applicant will increase the number of students who receive instruction in hard-to-staff schools and in specialty areas like special education.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15        | 13    |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There are five subcategories in this section. Each of the five sections are addressed in the narrative. The LEA organization of 10 divisions. An organizational chart is provided that indicates the people who are in leadership positions. Their resumes are also provided. The highly structured nature of this LEA demonstrates good support and services to all participating schools. In subcategory (b), the description provides a brief discussion of the flexibility and autonomy that school leadership can exercise. Area superintendents exercise relative autonomy as do principals in their schools. (c) Students are provided with progress and earn credits via mastery learning. The writers of the grant admit that implementation of programs that focus on mastery learning has been problematic. They contend that factors such as families, community stakeholders, and parents will be critical to successfully implementing this. They also foresee a change in structure, instruction, etc. Comparatively different from other sections, this did not include reference to empirical research to either explain the challenges of mastery learning or to models that exist at the current time. Subcategories (d) and (e) are addressed together. The focus is on ELLs and ESOLs. Descriptions of activities, general attention to the rationale, concrete deliverables, and reasonable timelines are provided. Some areas are not as clearly defined as others such as addressing the needs of students with disabilities.

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)  | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is divided into four subcategories. The first (a) part addressed in the narrative is brief. It provides four ways to access student performance data, etc. It appears from the description that access to the PLP requires access to the Internet. There is no attention to the possibility that a digital divide may exist. The next three subcategories (b), (c) and (d) were grouped into one response. Accessibility for teachers is addressed and there are systems available for teachers in need of data such as performance indicators. The IMS is proposed as the one stop source for data as needed by teachers, students, and parents. The ProgressBook is also described with a Parent Access Website is presented as is the OCPS Website. As indicated earlier there is an absence of discussion of what to do if a digital divide exists among the families and stakeholders served by this LEA.</p> |    |   |

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)  | 15        | 11    |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative presented in this section provided a clear explanation of how the plan will be monitored and measure. The RTTD Project Manager will play a major role in attending to the implementation of the reform measures. A list of nine activities are provided in this section. Two measures for evaluating the program are described as quasi-experimental: interrupted-time series and non-equivalent group. The description is adequate with a direct reference to the developers of the models. A list of key personnel is provided in this section to demonstrate the parties/individuals responsible for monitoring continuous improvement. Missing from the narrative was attention to how data collected and progress (or regress) is publicly shared.</p>  |           |       |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)   | 5         | 5     |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section focuses on strategies for on-going communication with internal and external stakeholders. The stakeholders (internal and external) are described as a diverse group. Specific names of the groups are not provided in this section. The plan proposed and described in this narrative. Diversity of stakeholders is mentioned at the beginning and in the final bullet of the guidelines for evaluation. On-going communication as presented in this narrative is highly organized with key goals, seven activities or processes (under the OCPS Management Communication), responsible parties are indicated, deliverables are identified, and a rationale is provided in the introduction.</p>  |           |       |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)   | 5         | 4     |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan presented in this section addresses all subcategories of the notice. The rationale is described with a reference to Eleven Essential Outcomes in Appendix 41. A brief description of the measure to provide timely and formative information is presented in two sentences with no reference to other sections in the plan. There is an absence of information here. Quality audits will serve as a means of reviewing and improving over time. Specific plans for the quality audits are not provided or addressed in specific terms. The final section of the narrative consists of a table of performance measures and a rationale for each. This as a detailed explanation of 22 performance measures. Within the table are the exact tools for measurement and the link to the appropriate essential outcome. In addition, a table with projected target school year dates are provided.</p> |           |       |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)  | 5         | 3     |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The OCPS Project Management protocols will be used for evaluating the effectiveness of RTTD. An evaluation tool with six components will serve as major means. Although not stated in this section, I assume that the Project Manager of RTTD will take a leadership role in evaluating the effectiveness of RTTD. Cost-benefit analysis will be the central focus of this work. A</p>   |           |       |

timeline is not presented in terms of how frequently the grant will undergo the cost-benefit analysis. The narrative presented in this section is not detailed and does not address any of the district funded activities e.g., professional development and activities that employ technology, etc. described in the notice. I award 3 points to this section.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative for the budget began with an overall summary. Each position and project was described along with a quantified value of the time dedicated to the project for a specific period of time during the life of the grant. The budget is well organized. All proposed expenditures for RTTD funds are accounted for with a clear rationale. The proposed salaries are reasonable as is the amounts planned for release time (substitutes) for professional development. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to sustain all of projects. The investment of RTTD is long-term in the sense that the proposal is designed to build infrastructure that will support the initiatives past the period of the grant in 2016. Each description of proposed expenditures is clear and concise. When appropriate, funds from sources other than RTTD are described in the budget which include percentages of time that key administrators such as principals and senior directors funded by the district. One-time investments are clearly described in the narrative in the budget. The narrative and accompanying tables provide an excellent explanation of the activities that are linked to key goals. The deliverables are clearly identified in the budget and narrative. A timeline and other time-related information is provided. Clearly, this is a high-quality plan for the budget.</p> |           |       |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provides for a high-quality plan for sustainability after the term of the grant. The key focus is to expand the strength of the current infrastructure of the LEA. In the narrative there is a recognition of the importance of sustaining the value of investments such as the RTTD funds in reforming the delivery and implementation of solid educational reform. Central to the sustainability of the proposed reform is the OCPS Philanthropic Strategic Plan Committee. This Committee was formed in June 2011. A MOU was endorsed (signed) by the school board, the superintendent, the president and executive director of the foundation committed to eleven (11) actions. In addition, the contributions of human capital is identified in existing programs such as the Teacher Incentive Fund and the Commission for Children. Clearly, this is a plan that recognizes the critical nature of sustainability after the term of the grant. I award 10 points to this section of the grant.</p>   |           |       |

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(1) Provide a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership that it has formed with public or private organizations...:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central to the narrative is the need to address early childhood and PreK education. Citing concerns of the LEA's school district, the narrative describes the compelling need to the importance of a solid, high-quality education program for pre-K students in the high-need areas of this community. This is well-documented and supported with a table of eight challenges associated with full day pre-K and four additional challenges to meet the needs of migrant pre-K children and their families. The proposal calls for higher standards for the four year old children through full day services. The plan provides a program for assessing progress of meeting the performance measures through the VPK Assessment and the FLKRS. Both of these assessments are describe as powerful forms of both formative and summative assessments. The schools will be located in the highest need neighborhoods. Specific neighborhoods are identified in appendix 46. The Nemours BrightStart full day pre-K program will be implemented for young children at risk for reading</li> </ul> |           |       |

failure. Citing a 2009 study conducted by Bailet, et al, the program is described as highly effective. A timeline for assessment and screening is presented in this section. The activites and responsible parties are clearly identified along with a list of six deliverables. A concise statement of the need for inclusion prekindergarten programs is presented at the end of the narrative. Measurable objectives and deliverables are identified as well. The proposal includes a parenting component in the implementation of the curriculum. Competencies that include monitoring, positive discipline, and confidence are part of the this component. A target of 75% family participation is identified in the desired results in the table on "Basic Parent Training." Clearly, this is high quality plan that provided a concise direction of the goals, clear empirically research-based rationale, reasonable activities and timelines, concrete deliverables, and identification of responsible parties for carrying out the directives of the plan. Tracking the progress is embedded in the programs.

Absolute Priority 1

|                     | Available   | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met   |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a coherent and comprehensive plan for creating effective learning environment and sustainability of reform after the grant has expired. The narratives, quantitative data, references to empirical research, and reform accomplished are particularly effective. This leads me to reach the conclusion that the grant demonstrated an ambitious, but achieveable high quality plan. The plan provides clearly identifiable key goals, reasonable activities and empirically-supported rationales, a reasonable timeline, concrete deliverables, and a reasonable plan for parties responsible for implementing the activities. The plans proposed for funding by RTTT will definitely promote student progress among all of the students and their families. College and career-ready plans were sensible and focused on the critical nature of developing a solid foundation at the K-12 areas. Educators are recognized for their important contributions to the proposal through programs like the plans for expanding the work of current faculty and administrators in the area of professional development. This proposal meets absolute priority 1.

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 186 |
|-------|-----|-----|